DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 676 CS 213 518

AUTHOR Jolliffe, Lee
TITLE Persuasive Elements of 100 Successful Magazine Query Letters.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (75th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, August 5-8, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Content Analysis; Discourse Analysis; Editors; Higher Education; Language Role; *Letters (Correspondence); *Persuasive Discourse; Writing Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Historical Background; Rhetorical Strategies; *Text Factors; *Writing Contexts

ABSTRACT

Building from scholarly works on persuasion and compliance-gaining, a study investigated magazine query letters that attempt to persuade an editor to buy the article offered, examining what message elements make them successful. Forty magazine editors provided copies of 100 recently accepted magazine query letters, which were compared with 50 rejected queries. The first 100 words of each of the letters were coded using measures from previous research. Results showed that several time-honored techniques were not confirmed as useful: readability, use of proximity words, and use of metaphors failed to provoke a positive response in editors. The most significant differences separating successful from unsuccessful letters were the use of concrete/senses words, as well as vividness and cohesion of the text. Others factors in successful letters included greater human interest and vocabulary diversity, more realistic sentences, and use of an opening narrative. A successful freelancer will thus construct a query letter that includes these elements: a story, with several individual characters, told in concrete terms with varied language and with care to maintain a sense of flow by use of cohesive devices that refer back to people and things previously mentioned in the text. (Fifty-one notes which comprise about half the document are included.) (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351676

Persuasive Elements of 100 Successful Magazine Query Letters

Lee Jolliffe
Assistant Professor
University of Missouri-Columbia
School of Journalism

Box 838
Columbia, MO 65205
(314) 882-2880 (office)
(314) 882-9002 (FAX)

Paper submitted to the Magazine Division for the AEJMC annual meeting in Momtreal, Canada, August 1992.

Research assistance by Meredith Ogburn and Liz Fakazis is gratefully acknowledged.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lee Jolliffee
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS213518

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Persuasive Elements of 100 Successful Magazine Query Letters

Introduction

Given the importance of the query letter as the primary sales tool of the 350,000 or more freelance magazine writers in the U.S.[1] and given that U.S. magazines, regardless of their circulation size, obtain an average of 50% of their nonfiction articles from freelancers,[2] it is remarkable how little substantive information is available about what makes a query letter successful.[3] While there is a constant flow of advice books to freelancers from the book publishing industry (indeed, a whole publishing company surviving on that topic alone), none of these offerings have been based on empirical research.[4]

This article examines the query letter empirically, building from scholarly works on persuasion and compliance-gaining. The present research provides insight into whether the message elements commonly found to be persuasive in experimental settings are equally compelling in real-life attempts at persuasion, namely. in magazine queries that attempt to persuade an editor to buy the article offered.

Background

Persuasion is one of the earliest practical matters to attract the attention of philosophers and scholars. One of the most commonly cited works in 20th century studies of persuasion is Aristotle's Rhetoric, although references to Demetrius, Demosthenes, Dionysius, Longinus, Cicero, Quintilian, and even

St. Augustine's works on persuasive oratory[5] are common.[6]

In the Elizabethan era, many treatises were written on the persuasive speech,[7] and many great writers from that era onward--among them, Bacon,[8] Burke,[9] Donne,[10] Milton,[11] Pope,[12] Shakespeare,[13] and Spenser[14]--have employed the classical strategies of rhetoric. The principles of classical (oral) rhetoric were, in Elizabethan times, applied to written discourse and made a central part of the curricula of English schools of the day. The classical value for a logical argument was balanced by the Elizabethan value for the poetic. Persuasive messages were thought to be most successful if they appealed to the mind and the senses. Both these aspects of the persuasive message--appeals to logic and the senses--continue to interest present-day researchers.[15]

The formation of the American republic brought another wave of works on rhetoric and oratory, by figures as prominent in the fashioning of the democracy as John Quincy Adams and Alexander Hamilton.[16] The importance of persuasive speech to the social changes of the period was cited by Corbett[17]:

> Students of the American Revolution need recall only Tom Paine's incendiary pamphlets, Patrick Henry's rousing speeches, Thomas Jefferson's daring Declaration of Independence, and Hamilton's and Madison's efforts to see constitutional democracy in the Federalist Papers to be convinced that in time of upheaval we rely heavily on the services of men [sic] equipped with persuasive tongues and pens.

The 18th century focus on moving one's audience also remains an interest of this century's persuasion researchers.[18]

The primary elements examined in modern studies of persuasion and compliance-gaining, as in other lines of communi-

cation research, are the communicator,[19] the receiver or audience,[20] the context or environment,[21] and the persuasive message.[22]

This work focuses on the message. since the message is the main segment of the persuasion process in freelance writing that the writer can influence. Factors found to be significantly persuasive in experimental persuasion research were used to select the message elements to examine in this real-life persuasion situation. The message elements are readability/-listenability,[23] vividness,[24] human interest,[25] vocabulary diversity,[26] realism and verifiability,[27] cohesion,[28] use of metaphor and simile,[29] and use of narrative.[30]

Much of the research done to date has focused on the spoken persuasive message. A clear relationship between elements of spoken and written persuasion has not been successfully established. While some research has shown a direct relation between persuasive elements of oral and written messages,[31] other findings have been contradictory.[32]

Here, message factors were selected for examination if they had been found to be persuasive in well-executed studies in either written or spoken messages. In addition to learning which persuasive message elements are most effective in a real-life persuasion situation, it may also be possible to discern which message factors are most persuasive in written, as opposed to spoken, persuasion attempts.

Method

The 100 editors of magazines listed in the Writer's Digest

magazine's "1990 Top 100 Markets"[33] were asked to provide copies of recently accepted nonfiction article queries for use in this content analysis. Forty editors responded with a total of 100 accepted magazine query letters.

For comparison, 50 rejected queries sent to magazine at Whittle Communication were used. These queries were collected over a two-month period in 1989, before the company turned its focus to television.

The first 100 words of each of the query letters were coded using measures from previous research. The accepted letter totals were treated as one sample, the rejected letter totals as a second sample. For each sample, the arithmetic mean, range, standard deviation, and population variance were obtained. To determine whether there was a significant difference between the two groups sufficient to conclude that they were drawn from two different populations, the difference between the means of each measurement was divided by an average of the standard deviations of each of the two groups, or $\{(\bar{X} - \bar{Y})/([S1+S2]/2)\}$. A difference of 0.1 standard deviation would not establish that the samples came from two different populations, while a difference of 0.5 would be quite significant.[34]

Readability. In a comprehensive study of written persuasion Carbone found respondents reacted more positively to persuasive messages containing shorter, simpler sentences and fewer multisyllabic words. Extensive research in reader attraction to news articles and advertisements has employed readability scales as well.[35] Here, readability was calculated using the Gunning formula, which requires totalling the number of

sentences, dividing it into 100, adding to this the number of polysyllabic words in a 100-word sample, and dividing that total by 0.04. The result is regarded as a "grade level" of the writing comparable to the grade levels in the U.S. education system.

Vividness. Vividness has been operationalized as the use of concrete words, words relating to the five senses, words that make a subject seem close in time or space (such as "now" or "near"), and words relating to emotions.[36] In all but one study (by Ralston and Thameling), vividness was found to influence persuasion success. Here, subtotals of words with clear denotations or words referring to things easily perceived using the five senses, "proximity" words, and emotional words were obtained and examined separately. These groups were also totaled for a composite "vivid words" category.

Human Interest. Carbone found that more credible persuaders create human interest by using more first and second person pronouns and describing issues by means of direct references to specific individual people. Low credibility persuaders, on the other hand, allege a generalized relationship between the audience and the issue.[37]

Here, all words in each 100-word sample that referred directly to individual people (not groups or group spokespeople) were counted. Singular personal pronouns and proper names were included, as were references like "this teacher" when such references recalled an individual previously introduced in the text.

Vocabulary Diversity. Carbone; Bradac, Bowers, and Courtwright; and Bradac, Konsky and Davies established that more persuasive messages include greater vocabulary diversity.[38] This factor was operationalized as the number of unrepeated words that occurred in the first 100 words of each letter.

Realism and Verifiability. Rosenthal, as well as Borgida and Nisbett,[39] learned that abstract information is less convincing than concrete, specific, verifiable information in persuasive message. Petty and Cacioppo[40] found that an advertising message that creates a favorable impression may bring about short-term persuasion, but to create a long-term positive evaluation of a product, concrete, verifiable information about that product must be offered. Hazelton, Cupach, and Liska found messages rated by their audiences as more persuasive if they were "more logical" and "less ambiguous," and Carbone found audiences preferred messages that included more realistic and factual sentences.[41]

Methods devised by Gillie[42] are typically used to measure realism and verifiability in persuasive writing, and his methods were employed here. Specifically, the number of sentences in each 100-word sample that referred to events, conditions, or situations in the real, physical world were counted. (Tautologies, policy statements, interjections, imperatives, value judgments, emotional statements, and the like were excluded.) Then, of these realistic sentences, a second tally was made of the completely unambiguous sentences, those containing no words or phrases that could possibly be interpreted in two ways.

Cohesion. Cohesion in text is the sense of a single,

flowing piece of writing and cohesion has been found to assist in making text more persuasive. Cohesion is created by the use of surface connectors that tie current text to previous text through devices like the repetition of a key phrase or the use of "replacers" like pronouns, the definite article "the," demonstratives ("this," "that," "there"), and comparative forms ("as," "like").[43] Each occurrence of these words in the samples was counted. In addition, all substitution devices employing counter or marker words (i.e., using such as "ones" or "do so") instead of repeating words, a phrase or a clause were) counted. The total percentage of marker words and phrases was obtained and scored as percent of "cohesive words."

Metaphor and Simile. Metaphor, simile, and analogy in persuasive messages have been examined by Bowers and Osborn, Reinsch, and McCroskey and Combs.[44] Reinsch examined both metaphor and simile in persuasive speaking, where he found that metaphor made a speech significantly more convincing than literal language, but that simile did not significantly increase persuasive effect.[45] Both elements were examined in the query letters at hand to learn whether Reinsch's results are generalizable.

Narrative Form. The use of narratives to relate true stories in the media has been thoroughly explored by many scholars,[46] to such an extent that at least two scholars have declared the field "fully exposed."[47] According to Aucoin, the essential components of a narrative are "a temporal sequence of events (having a beginning, a middle, and an end), an actor

(someone or thing that moves through time and is central to the action), connexity (the events must have some relation to one another), action (usually conflict), and a narrator (one who tells the story to the reader)." Because many trade press authors of books on freelancing advise a writer to open a query with the planned opening of the magazine article, to catch the magazine editor's attention, these queries were examined to see whether they used these listed elements of a narrative in their opening 100 words.

It would be expected that the successful queries would be characterized by fluent use of narrative, while the novice or rejected writers would be more likely to open with weak or poorly conceived text. Flower, Flower and Hayes, and Scardamalia and Bereiter[48] have shown that more skillful writers conceptualize their main point in writing as they write, carrying out "a variety of problem-solving operations involving content-identifying goals and constraints, searching, [and] testing."[49] Novice writers, on the other hand, "show little in the way of concerns about the main point."[50]

Two coders were used, with an intercoder reliability of 92%.

Results

Results of this analysis of real-life persuasion attempts strongly confirmed some previous findings, while not supporting other experimental results.

Readability. The average readability of both groups was identical, at the 10.8th grade level. The ranges were similar, with accepted at 4.56 to 22.8 and rejected at 3.22 to 22. The

difference between the means of the two samples shows no significant difference between the two groups (at 0.0074).

Vividness. Three subcategories were combined for the total vividness measure, all parts of vividness definitions of previous researchers. Words with clear denotations and words describing the world as we can perceive it through the five senses were counted as a subcategory, "concrete" words. There was a statistically significant difference between the samples for this category:

	Mean	Range
Accepted	39.4%	24-54%
Rejected	22.3%	2-44%.

The Minium calculation of the number of standard deviations separating the two means[51] showed 2.16 standard deviations between the means, well above the 0.5 needed for significance. On this measure, these two groups are clearly drawn from different populations. In other words, successful freelancers use far more concrete words than unsuccessful writers.

Other types of words defined as "vivid" by previous researchers were not very important in distinguishing successful from unsuccessful freelancers. In 100 words, neither the accepted nor the rejected query letters relied heavily on words to establish proximity in time or place or words that referred to emotions. Accepted letters averaged 0.2 proximity words, with a range of 0-4, and rejected letters averaged 0.6 proximity words, with a range of 0-9. Standard deviations between the means was 0.35 for proximity and 0.38 for emotions, greater than would be

expected for two samples drawn from the same population, but not reaching the 0.50 needed for a strong significance.

The combination of these three subcategories did show a significant difference between the two groups. Accepted queries included an average of 40% vivid words, while rejected queries averaged only 24% vivid words. The range of vividness in accepted queries was 28 to 54%, while for rejected queries the range was 2 to 44% vivid words. The number of standard deviations between the two groups was 2.08, well above the 0.50 mark.

Human Interest. Accepted queries included far more direct references to specific people (mean 5.1, range 0 to 22). Rejected queries averaged 2.3 mentions of specific people, with a range from 0 to 11. Again, a statistically significant difference between the two groups existed, with 0.89 standard deviations separating the two means.

Vocabulary Diversity. Vocabulary diversity means were similar for the two groups, with 69.5% diverse vocabulary used by the accepted writers and 62.74% diverse vocabulary used by the rejected writers. However, the standard deviation and variance in the rejected group were extremely high (at 18.04 and 325.57, respectively), so that the mean must be regarded as unreliable. Thus, the finding of 0.50 standard deviations' difference between the means of the two samples, though apparently significant, must be regarded as tentative at best. Vocabulary diversity cannot be considered a definitive difference between the successful and unsuccessful freelancer.

Realism and Verifiability. In an average of 5 sentences per

100-word extract from each letter, the accepted writers used 3.58 realistic sentences, while the rejected writers used 2.34. Of these realistic sentences, 2.15 of those from the accepted writers contained no ambiguities and were thus counted also as verifiable; at the same time, 1.98 of those from the rejected writers were verifiable. Ranges were: accepted/realism 0 to 6 sentences, rejected/realism 0 to 5 sentences; accepted/-verifiability 0 to 5 sentences, rejected/verifiability 0 to 4 sentences. Difference in use of realistic sentences was statistically significant, with a 0.91 standard deviations' difference between the means. Difference in use of verifiable sentences was not significant, at 0.13 S.D.'s difference between the means. Thus, successful writers may write more down-to-earth prose than unsuccessful writers, though that prose may not be clearly verifiable.

Cohesion. Here, an extremely significant difference existed between the two groups. The successful freelancers used an average of 11.8% cohesive words (range 1 to 25%); their prose was carefully built around continuing references to previously mentioned items. The unsuccessful freelancers used only 4.19% cohesive words (range 0 to 12%). The standard deviations' difference between the means was 2.58.

Metaphor and Simile. Interestingly, that holdover technique from the Elizabethan era is not widely used in real-life persuasive text today, nor is it helpful in persuasion efforts today. Successful query writers used an average of 0.21 metaphors, similes, and analogies, with a range of 0 to 2;

unsuccessful writers used an average of 0.21 metaphoric devices, with a range of 0 to 6. Standard deviations' difference was insignificant at 0.12.

Narrative Form. The accepted queries were much more likely to open with a narrative (41%) than the rejected queries (19%). The difference between the two groups' standard deviations was 1.14, more than twice the 0.5 level required for significance.

Discussion

While many measures of persuasion shown to be successful in experimental situations were supported by this research, several time-honored techniques were not confirmed as useful in persuading editors to buy magazine articles. Most surprising were the failures of readability measures, use of proximity words, and use of metaphors to evoke a positive response in magazine editors.

Readability, measured in terms of writing short sentences and using short words, does not seem to engage the attention of the professional editor. It would appear that what those words say, who they refer to, and how they develop a storyline are much more important than the mere tally of syllables and sentences.

Proximity, too, long considered to be a critical selection factor in newspaper stories, was not much used by successful query writers and so may be regarded as unimportant in engaging or persuading magazine editors.

Finally, metaphor, simile and analogy, so dear to the rhetorician, are not widely used in modern writing and tended to be used slightly more often by the unsuccessful persuaders here.

Of the elements previous researchers have combined or used to define writing's vividness, only the strongly denotative (concrete) words and words referring to a world perceivable with the five senses were supported here as separating the persuasive from the unpersuasive writer. Proximity and emotion words did not contribute to the vividness difference between the accepted and rejected letters examined.

The subcategory of concrete/senses words, as well as the vividness and cohesion of the text, were the most strongly significant differences that separated the successful from the unsuccessful writers.

However, other factors were also supported as clearly defining the differences between the two groups: Greater human interest and vocabulary diversity, more realistic sentences, and use of an opening narrative also set the successful freelancers apart from the rejected ones.

A successful freelancer will thus construct a query letter that includes these elements; a story, with several individual characters, told in concrete terms with varied language and with care to maintain a sense of flow by use of cohesive devices that refer back to people and things previously mentioned in the text.

Footnotes

1. Calculated from data from the Audit Bureau of Circulation, "ABC audit reports on General and Farm magazines (excluding comics and newspaper supplements) for the first six months of each year" (New York: ABC, 1987), "circulation of Writer's Digest Magazine"; Kirk Polking, Joan Bloss, and Colleen Cannon, Writer's Encyclopedia (Cincinnati: Writer's Digest Books, 1988), pp. 206-208, 314-315, 435, 487; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Writers, artists, and entertainers," Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Spring, 1988· American Society of Journalists and Authors, Membership Directory 1992 (New York: ASJA, 1992);

Peggy Randall, letter to the author from the assistant director, The Authors Guild, Inc., October 7, 1988; James Lee Young, letter to the author from the executive director, National Writers Club, September 9, 1988; and corrected statistically using U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Adult population of the U.S." (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977-1987).

2. Lee B. Jolliffe, Factors affecting successful sale of articles to magazines. Dissertation, Ohio University 1989, p. 33.

3. Ibid., p. 11.

4. Ibid., p. 33.

5. cf, Aristotle, Rhetoric, trans., W. Rhys Roberts (New York: Modern Library, 1954); Demetrius, On style, trans. W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1902); Demosthenes, On the crown, ed. William Watson Goodwin (New York: Arno Press, 1979); Dionysius, On literary composition, trans. W. Rhys Roberts, 1910; Longinus, On the sublime, (1st century), trans. James A. Arieti and John M. Crossett (New York: E. Mellen Press, 1985); Marcus Tullius Cicero, De inventione, trans. H.M. Hubbell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949); Marcus Tullius Cicero, De optimo genere oratorum, trans. H.M. Hubbell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949); Marcus Tullius Cicero, De oratore, trans. E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham (Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1942); Marcus Tullius Cicero, Topica, trans. H.M. Hubbell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949); Quintilian, Institutio oratoria, trans. H.E. Butler (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985); Quintilian, On the early education of the citizen-orator, ed. James Jerome Murphy and trans. Rev. John Selby Watson (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965); St. Augustine, On Christian doctrine; Book IV, Rhetoric of the sermon, trans. D.W. Robertson, Jr. (Indianapolis: Library of Liberal Arts, 1958).

6. cf, Kenneth E. Andersen and T. Clevenger, "A summary of experimental research in ethos," Speech Monographs 30: 59-78 (1963); Eldon Baker, "The immediate effects of perceived speaker disorganization on speaker credibility and audience attitude change in persuasive speaking," Western Speech Communication 29: 148-161 (1965); John Waite Bowers and Michael M. Osborn, "Attitudinal effects of selected types of concluding metaphors in persuasive speeches," Speech Monographs 33(2): 147-155 (1966); James W. Gibson, Charles R. Gruner, Robert J. Kibler, and Francis J. Kelly, "A quantitative examination of differences and similarities in written and spoken messages," Speech Monographs 33(4): 444-451 (1966); Lee O. Thayer, Communication and communication systems (Homewood, IL: Irwin Publishers, 1968); Michael E. Roloff and Gerald R. Miller, eds., Persuasion: new directions in theory and research (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980); James C. McCroskey and Thomas J. Young, "Ethos and credibility: the construct and its measurement after three decades," Central States Speech Journal 32: 24-34 (1981); S. Michael Halloran,

"Rhetoric in the American college curriculum: the decline of public discourse," PRE/TEXT 3: 245-275 (1982); Mary John Smith, Persuasion and human action: a review and critique of social influence theories (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1982); John R. Anderson, Language, memory, and thought (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1983); Dominic A. Infante, Kenneth R. Parker, Christopher H. Clarke, Laverne Wilson, and Indrani A. Nathu, "A comparison of factor and functional approaches to source credibility," Communication Quarterly 31(1): 43-48 (1983); Charles Arthur Willard, Argumentation and the social grounds of knowledge (University, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1983); Raymond S. Ross, Understanding persuasion: foundations and practice (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1985); McDonald, Daniel, The language of argument, 5th ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1986); Dennis R. Bormann, "George Campbell's Cura Prima on eloquence-1758." Quarterly Journal of Speech 74: 35-51 (1988); Alan G. Gross, "On the shoulders of giants: seventeenth-century optics as an argument field," Quarterly Journal of Speech 74: 1-17 (1988); Paul E. Reid, "The first and fifth Boylston professors: a view of two worlds," Quarterly Journal of Speech 74: 229-240 (1988).

7. Leonard Cox. The arte or crafte of rhethoryke (1530) ed. F.I. Carpenter (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899); Richard Sherry, A treatise on schemes and tropes (1530) intro. and index by Herbert W. Hildebrant, (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press); Thomas Wilson, Arte of rhetorique, (1553) ed. Thomas J. Derrick (New York: Garland Park, 1982); Richard Rainolde, The foundacion of rhetorike (London: I. Kingston, 1563, reproduced by Menston: Scholar Press, 1972); Henry Peacham, The garden of eloquence (London: H. Jackson, 1577); Abraham Fraunce, The Arcadian rhetorike (1588) ed. Ethel Seaton (Oxford: Luttrell Society Reprints, 1950); Goerge Puttenham, The art of English poesie, (1589) (Reprint, New York: De Capo Press); John Hoskins, Directions for speech and style (1600) ed. Hoyt H. Hudson (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935).

8. Karl R. Wallace, Francis Bacon on communication and rhetoric; or: the art of applying reason to imagination for the better moving of the will (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943); George Williamson, The Senecan amble: a study of prose from Bacon to Collier (London: Farber and Farber, 1951); Brian Vickers, Francis Bacon and Renaissance prose (London: Methuen, 1969).

9. Paul Fussell, The rhetorical works of Augustan humanism: ethics and imagery from Swift to Burke (Oxford, 1965).

10. Joan Webber, Contrary music; the prose style of John Donne (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963).

11. Donard Lemen Clark, John Milton at St. Paul's School: a study of ancient rhetoric in English Renaissance education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).

12. Martin Kallich, Heav'n's first law: rhetoric and order in

Pope's essay on man (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University, 1967).

13. Thomas Whitfield Baldwin, William Shakespere's small Latin & lesse Greeke 2 vols. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944); Sister Miriam Joseph, Shakespeare's use of the arts of language (New York, 1947); Brian Vickers. The artistry of Shakespeare's poetry (London: Methuen, 1969).

14. Herbert David Rix, Rhetoric in Spenser's poetry (State College: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940).

15. John Waite Bowers and Michael M. Osborn. "Attitudinal effects of selected types of concluding metaphors in persuasive speeches," Speech Monographs 33(2): 147-155 (1966): N. Lamar Reinsch, Jr., "An investigation of the effects of the metaphor and simile in persuasive discourse," Speech Monographs 38(2): 142-145 (1971); James C. McCroskey and Walter H. Combs, "The effects of the use of analogy on attitude change and source credibility," Journal of Communication 19: 333-339 (1969); Eugene Borgida and Richard E. Nisbett, "The differential impact of abstract vs. concrete information on decisions," Journal of Applied Social Psychology 7(3): 258-271 (1977); Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, "Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: application to advertising," in Advertising and consumer psychology, ed. Larry Percy and Arch G. Woodside (Lexington, MS: D.C. Heath, 1983), pp. 3-23.

16. John Quincy Adams, Lectures on rhetoric and oratory, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1810); see also George Campbell, The philosophy of rhetoric, (1776) ed. Lloyd F. Bitzer (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963); Hugh Blair, Lectures on rhetoric and belles-lettres (1783) ed. Harold Harding (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963); Richard Whateley, Elements of rhetoric (1828) ed. Douglas Ehninger (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1828); Bower Aly, The rhetoric of Alexander Hamilton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965).

17. Edward P.J. Corbett, Classical rhetoric for the modern student (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 33.

18. Gerald Marwell and David R. Schmitt, "Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: an empirical analysis," Sociometry 30: 350-365 (1967): Dennis W. Organ, "Social exchange and psychological reactance in a simulated superior-subordinate relationship," Organization Behavior and Human Psychology 12: 132-142 (1974); Gerald R. Miller, Franklin Boster, Michael E. Roloff, and David Seibold, "Compliance-gaining strategies: a typology and some findings concerning effects of situational differences," Communication Monographs 44: 37-51 (1977); Margaret L. McLaughlin, Michael J. Cody, and Carl S. Robey, "Situational influences on the selection of strategies to resist compliance-gaining attempts," Human Communication Research 7: 14-36 (1980); P.E. Spector, "Behavior in organizations as a function

of employee's locus of control," Psychological Bulletin 91: 482-487 (1982); Michael Burgoon, James P. Dillard, and Noel E. Doran, "Friendly or unfriendly persuasion: the effects of violations of expectations by males and females," Human Communication Research 10(2): 284-294 (1983); Franklin J. Boster and James B. Stiff, "Compliance-gaining message selection behavior," Human Communication Research 10: 539-557 (1984); Gerald R. Miller, Michael Burgoon, and Judee K. Burgoon, "The functions of human communication in changing attitudes and gaining compliance," in Handbook of rhetorical and communication theory, eds. Carrol C. Arnold and John Waite Bowers (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1984), pp. 400-474; Karen Tracey, Robert T. Craig, Martin Smith, and Frances Spisak, "The discourse of requests: assessment of a compliance-gaining approach," Human Communication Research 10(4): 513-538 (1984); K.G. Lamude, Tom D. Daniels, and K. White, "Managing the boss: locus of control and subordinates' selection of compliance-gaining strategies in upward communication," presented at the International Communication Association Meeting, Chicago, 1986; David K. Roach, "University department chairs' use of compliance-gaining strategies," Communication Quarterly 39(1): 75-90 (1991).

19. **Studies of the effects of the communicator on persuasion success fall roughly into five categories:**

1) simple attributes of the sender (such as competence and trustworthiness), cf Elliot Aronson and Burton W. Golden, "The effect of relevant and irrelevant aspects of communicator credibility," Journal of Personality 30: 136-144 (1962); Judson Mills and Elliott Aronson, "Opinion change as a function of the communicator's attractiveness and desire to influence," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1: 173-177 (1965); James C. McCroskey, "Scales for the measurement of ethos," Speech Monographs 33: 65-72 (1966); Raymond A. Bauer, "Source effect and persuasibility: a new look," in Risk taking and information handling in consumer behavior, ed. Donald F. Cox (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1967), pp. 559-578; John Waite Bowers and William A. Phillips, "A note on the generality of source-credibility scales," Speech Monographs 34: 185-186 (1967); David Markham, "The dimensions of source credibility of television newscasters," Journal of Communication 18: 57-64 (1968); John R. Wenburg, "Studies of credibility of sources and bias of receivers," paper presented at the annual convention of the National Society for the Study of Communication, New York City, April, 1968; Jack I. Whitehead, "Factors of source credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech 54: 59-63 (1968); David K. Berlo, James B. Lemert, and Robert J. Mertz, "Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources," Public Opinion Quarterly 33: 563-576 (1969); James C. McCroskey, Michael D. Scott, and Thomas J. Young, "The dimensions of source credibility for spouses and peers," paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association, Fresno, CA, November, 1971; Roderick P. Hart and Don M. Burks, "Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction," Speech Monographs 39: 75-91 (1972); Vernon Stone and James L. Hoyt, "Effect of likability and relevance of

expertness," Journalism Quarterly 51: 314-317 (1974); Gary Cronkhite, "Effects of rater-concept-scale interactions and use of different factoring procedures upon evaluative factor structure," Human Communication Research 2(4): 316-329 (1976); Jo Liska, Dimensions of source credibility: a field-dependent approach, dissertation, University of Colorado, 1976; Michael W. Singletary, "Components of credibility of a favorable news source," Journalism Quarterly 53: 316-319 (1976); Gary Cronkhite and Jo Liska, "Judgment of communicant acceptability," in Persuasion: new directions in theory and research, eds. Michael E. Roloff and Gerald R. Miller (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980), pp. 101-139; Roderick P. Hart, Robert E. Carlson, and William F. Eadie, "Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity," Communication Monographs 47: 1-22 (1980); Dominic A. Infante, "Similarity between advocate and receiver: the role of instrumentality," Central States Speech Journal 29(3): 187-193 (1978); Glenn R. Hass, "Effects of source characteristics on cognitive responses and persuasion," in Cognitive responses in persuasion, eds. Richard E. Petty, Thomas M. Ostrom, and Timothy C. Brock (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980); J.M. Wiemann and C.W. Kelly, "Pragmatics of interpersonal competence," in Rigor and imagination: essays from the legacy of Gregory Bateson, eds. C. Wilder-Mott and J.H. Weakland (New York: Praeger, 1981), pp. 283-297; Dominic A. Infante, Kenneth R. Parker, Christopher H. Clarke, Laverne Wilson, and Indrani A. Nathu, "A comparison of factor and functional approaches to source credibility," Communication Quarterly 31(1): 43-48 (1983); Brian H. Spitzberg, "Communicative competence as knowledge, skill, and impression," Communication Education 32: 323-329 (1983); J.M. Wiemann and James J. Bradac, "Some issues in the study of communicative competence," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC, 1983; William F. Eadie and J.W. Paulson, "Communicator attitudes, communicator style, and communication competence," Western Journal of Speech Communication 48: 390-407 (1984); Brian H. Spitzberg and Michael L. Hecht, "A component model of relational competence," Human Communication Research 10: 575-600 (1984); Karen Tracey, Robert T. Craig, Martin Smith, and Frances Spisak, "The discourse of requests: assessment of a compliance-gaining approach," Human Communication Research 10(4): 513-538 (1984); Jean-Charles Chebat and Pierre Filiatrault, "Credibility, source identification and message acceptance: the case of political persuasion," Political Communication and Persuasion 4(3): 153-160 (1987);
2) attributes the receiver infers (from the appearance of the sender or the content of the message), cf Gary Cronkhite and Jo Liska, "A critique of factor analytic approaches to the study of credibility," Communication Monographs 43(2): 91-107 (1976); Joel Huber and John McCann, "The impact of inferential beliefs on product evaluations," Journal of Marketing Research 19: 324-333 (1982); Irwin P. Levin, Richard D. Johnson, and Stephen V. Faraone, "Information integration in price-quality tradeoffs: the effects of missing information," Memory & Cognition 12:96-102 (1984); Richard Johnson and Irwin P. Levin, "More than meets the eye: effect of missing information on purchase evaluations," Journal

of Consumer Research 12: 169-177 (1985); Judee K. Burgoon and others, "Nonverbal behaviors, persuasion, and credibility," Human Communication Research 17(1): 140-169 (1990).

3) states of the sender that affect the quality of the message (such as bias or stress), cf Information and Education Division, U.S. War Department, "The effects of presenting 'one side' versus 'both sides' in changing opinions on a controversial subject," in Readings in Social Psychology, eds. Eleanor E. Maccoby, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene L. Hartley (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1947), pp. 566-577; Edmond Winston Jordan Faison, "Effectiveness of one-sided and two-sided mass communications in advertising," Public Opinion Quarterly 25: 468-469 (1961); Bradley S. Greenburg and Percy H. Tannenbaum, "Communicator performance under cognitive stress," Journalism Quarterly 39: 169-178 (1962); John R. Wenburg, "Studies of credibility of sources and bias of receivers," paper presented at the annual convention of the National Society for the Study of Communication, New York City, April, 1968; Robert D. Dycus, "Relative efficacy of a one-sided vs. two-sided communication in a simulated government evaluation of proposals," Psychological Reports 38: 787-790 (1976); James J. Bradac, John Waite Bowers, and John Courtwright, "Three language variables in communication research: intensity, immediacy, and diversity," Human Communication Research 5(3): 257-269 (1979);

4) adaptive strategies the persuader uses to increase influence (such as changing the complexity of the message for different audiences), cf Roderick P. Hart and Don M. Burks, "Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction," Speech Monographs 39: 75-91 (1972); Frank E. Millar, L. Edna Rogers-Millar, and John A. Courtwright, "Relational control and dyadic understanding: an exploratory predictive regression model," in Communication yearbook 3, ed. Dan Nimmo (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1979), pp. 213-224; Donald G. Ellis and Linda McCallister, "Relational control sequences and sex-typed androgenous groups," Western Journal of Speech Communication 44:35-49 (1980); James A. Gilchrist, Larry D. Browning, and John W. Bowers, "Rhetorical sensitivity in bargaining situations: a field study," paper presented at the meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Chicago, April 1980; Roderick P. Hart, Robert E. Carlson, and William F. Eadie, "Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity," Communication Monographs 47: 1-22 (1980); S.A. Ward, "Rhetorically sensitive supervisory communication: a situational analysis," paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, CA, 1981; James L. Applegate, "The impact of construct system development on communication and impression formation in persuasive contexts," Communication Monographs 49(4): 277-289 (1982); M.A. Bell and S.J. Lui, "A comparison of rhetorical sensitivity and managerial talent in business settings," paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, KY, November 1982; Franklin J. Boster and James B. Stiff, "Compliance-gaining message selection behavior," Human Communication Research 10: 539-557 (1984); William F. Eadie and Robert G. Powell, "Rhetorical sensitivity and persuasive communication behavior," ERIC ED 280 120 (1986); H. Witteman and

M.A. Fitzpatrick, "Compliance-gaining in marital interaction: power bases, processes, and outcomes," Communication Monographs 53: 130-144 (1986); and

5) **interactions between the communicator and other elements of the persuasion process (such as the relationship of the source's credibility to judgments of the message)**, cf Roderick P. Hart and Don M. Burks, "Rhetorical sensitivity and social interaction," Speech Monographs 39: 75-91 (1972); Donald Lumsden, "An experimental study of source-message interaction in a personality impression task," Communication Monographs 44(2): 121-129 (1977); Dominic A. Infante, "Similarity between advocate and receiver: the role of instrumentality," Central States Speech Journal 29(3): 187-193 (1978); Conrad Glenn Page Smith, Selecting a source of local television news in the Salt Lake City SMSA: a multivariate analysis of cognitive and affective factors for 384 randomly-selected newscast viewers, Dissertation, Temple University, 1980; James L. Applegate, "The impact of construct system development on communication and impression formation in persuasive contexts," Communication Monographs 49(4): 277-289 (1982); William R. Cupach and Brian H. Spitzberg, "Trait versus state: a comparison of dispositional and situational measures of interpersonal communication competence," Western Journal of Speech Communication 47: 364-379 (1983); Jean-Charles Chebat and others, "Limits of credibility: the case of political persuasion," Journal of Social Psychology 130(2): 157-167 (1990); Charles A. Hill, "The impact of persona on the success of written arguments," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Compositions and Communication, Boston, MA, March 1991.

20. **Audiences have often figured simplistically in much of persuasion literature, as the source of ratings of speakers and messages**, cf Gerald R. Miller and Murray A. Hewgill, "The effect of variations in nonfluency on audience ratings of source credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech 50: 36-44 (1964); Eldon Baker, "The immediate effects of perceived speaker disorganization on speaker credibility and audience attitude change in persuasive speaking," Western Speech Communication 29: 148-161 (1965); John Waite Bowers and Michael M. Osborn, "Attitudinal effects of selected types of concluding metaphors in persuasive speeches," Speech Monographs 33(2): 147-155 (1966); Donald L. Lumsden, "An experimental study of source-message interaction in a personality impression task," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 20: 181-191 (1977); Robert W. Norton and Loyd S. Pettegrew, "Communicator style as an effect determinant of attraction," Communication Research 4(3): 257-282 (1978); V. Hazelton, William R. Cupach, and Jo Liska, "Message style: an investigation of the perceived characteristics of persuasive messages," Journal of Social Behavior and Personality 1(4): 565-574 (1986); Donald Dean Morley, "Subjective message constructs: a theory of persuasion," Communication Monographs 54(2): 183-203 (1987); Rebecca Collins and Shelley E. Taylor, "The vividness effect: elusive or illusory?" Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 24(1): 1-18 (1988); a few researchers have examined audience more closely, studying

recipient characteristics (cf Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, "Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: application to advertising," in Advertising and consumer psychology, ed. Larry Percy and Arch G. Woodside (Lexington, MS: D.C. Heath, 1983), pp. 3-23; Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, "Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37: 1915-1921 (1979); Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, "The effects of involvement on responses to argument quantity and quality: central and peripheral routes to persuasion," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 46: 69-81 (1984) Richard E. Petty, John T. Cacioppo, and D. Schumann, "Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: the moderating role of involvement," Journal of Consumer Research 10(2): 135-146 (1983). **Other areas of interest to researchers investigating audiences include response processes**, cf David Wendell Miller and Martin Kenneth Starr, The structure of human decisions (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967); Erwin P. Bettinghaus and John R. Basehart, "Specific features affecting attitude change," Journal of Communications 19(3): 227-238 (1969); Paul E. Green and Yoram Wind, Multiattribute decision-making in marketing (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1974); James R. Bettman and Jacob Jacoby, "Patterns of processing in consumer information acquisition," in Advances in Consumer Research, proceedings of the Association for Consumer Research sixth annual conference, Vol. III, ed. Beverlee B. Anderson (Cincinnati, 1976), pp. 315-320; Herbert A. Simon, Administrative behavior: a study of decision-making processes in administrative organization, 3rd ed. (New York: Free Press, 1976); James R. Bettman and Pradeep Kakkar, "Effects of information presentation format on consumer information acquisition strategies," Journal of Consumer Research 3: 233-240 (1977); D. Grether and L. Wilde, "An analysis of conjunctive choice: theory and experiments," Journal of Consumer Research 10(4): 373-385 (1984); Robin Hogarth, Judgement and choice, 2nd ed. (Chichester: John Wiley & Sones, 1977); Laurence Paquette and Thomas Kida, "The effect of decision strategy and task complexity on decision performance," Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 41: 128-142 (1988); Roger Tourangeau and Kenneth A. Rasinski, "Cognitive processes underlying context effects in attitude measurement," Psychological Bulletin 103(3): 299-314 (1988); effects of previous beliefs and information (cf Kenneth E. Andersen, Persuasion, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978), p. 7; Allan M. Collins and Elizabeth F. Loftus, "A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing," Psychological Review 82: 407-428 (1975); David E. Rumelhart, "Notes on a schema for stories," in Representation and understanding: studies in cognitive science, eds. Daniel G. Bobrow and Alan Collins (New York: Academic Press, 1975), pp. 211-236; Nancy Cantor and Walter Mischel, "Traits as prototypes: effects on recognition memory," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 35: 38-49 (1977); David E. Rumelhart and Andrew Ortony, "The representation of knowledge in memory," in Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge, eds. Richard C. Anderson, Rand J. Spiro, and William E. Montague (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1977),

pp. 99-135; Roger Schank and Robert P. Abelson, Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1977); Gordon H. Bower, John B. Black, and Terrence J. Turner, "Scripts in comprehension and memory," Cognitive Psychology 11: 177-220 (1979); Arthur C. Graesser, Sandra L. Gordon, and Jesse O. Sawyer, "Recognition memory for typical and atypical actions in scripted activities: tests of a script pointer + tag hypothesis," Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior 18: 319-332 (1979); Shelley Chaiken, "Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 39: 752-766 (1980); Hillel J. Einhorn, "Learning from experience and sub-optimal rules in decision making," in Cognitive processes in choice and decision behavior, ed. Thomas S. Wallsten (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980); Patricia W. Linville and Edward E. Jones, "Polarized appraisal of out-group members," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 28: 689-703 (1980); Robert P. Abelson, "Psychological status of the script concept," American Psychologist 36: 715-739 (1981); David L. Hamilton, Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1981); Reid Hastie, "Schematic principles in person memory," in Social cognition: the Ontario symposium, vol. 1, eds. E. Tory Higgins, C. Peter Herman, and Mark P. Zanna (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1981), pp. 39-88; Susan T. Fiske and Donald R. Kinder, "Involvement, expertise, and schema use: evidence from political cognition," in Personality, cognition, and social interaction, eds. Nancy Cantor and John F. Kihlstrom (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1981), pp. 171-192; Thomas M. Ostrom, John B. Pryor, and David D. Simpson, "The organization of social information," in Social cognition: the Ontario symposium, vol. 1, eds. E. Tory Higgins, C. Peter Herman, and Mark P. Zanna (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1981), pp. 3-38; Patricia W. Linville, "The complexity-extremity effect and age-based stereotyping," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 42: 193-210 (1982); John B. Pryor, David D. Simpson, Mark L. Mitchell, Thomas Ostrom, and John Lydon, "Structural selectivity in the retrieval of social information," Social Cognition 1: 336-357 (1982); D.C. McCann, Thomas M. Ostrom, Mark Mitchell, J.A. Herstein, and Thomas P. Pusateri, "Blocking of person information in small social groupings: the formation of person categories," Technical report no. TR/ONR-9, Social Psychology Bulletin 83-1 (1983); Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, "The effects of involvement on responses to argument quantity and quality: central and peripheral routes to persuasion," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 46: 69-81 (1984); John B. Pryor, Teri L. Kott, and Gregory R. Bovee, "The influence of information redundancy upon the use of traits and persons as organizing categories. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 20: 246-262 (1984); Thomas P. Pusateri, The formation of distinct memories of unfamiliar persons, Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1984; Patricia G. Devine and Thomas M. Ostrom, "Cognitive mediation of inconsistency discounting," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 49: 5-21 (1985); Susan T. Fiske and Linda M. Dyer, "Structure and development of social schemata: evidence from positive and negative transfer effects," Journal of Personality

and Social Psychology 48: 839-852 (1985); Connie Roser, "Involvement, attention, and perceptions of message relevance in the response to persuasive appeals," Communication Research 17(5): 571-600 (1990); **influence of recipient traits**, cf Alice H. Eagly, "Recipient characteristics as determinants of responses to persuasion," in Cognitive responses in persuasion, eds. Richard E. Petty, Thomas M. Ostrom and Timothy C. Brock (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1981); Tae Seop Lim, "The influences of receivers' resistance on persuaders' verbal aggressiveness," Communication Quarterly 38(2): 170-188 (1990); **and degree of openness or resistance to persuasion** (Glenn R. Hass, "Effects of source characteristics on cognitive responses and persuasion," in Cognitive responses in persuasion, eds. Richard E. Petty, Thomas M. Ostrom, and Timothy C. Brock. (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980); E. Tory Higgins and Gillian King, "Accessibility of social constructs: information processing consequences of individual and contextual variability," in Personality, cognition, and social interaction, eds. Nancy Cantor and John F. Kihlstrom (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1981), pp. 69-122; Ellen Wartella, " Cognitive and affective factors of TV's influence on children," Western Journal of Speech Communication 48(2): 171-183 (1984); J.W. Neuliep, "Self-report vs actual use of persuasive messages by high and low dogmatics," Journal of Social Behavior and Personality 1(2): 213-222 (1986); Greg J. Lessne and Nicholas M. Didow, Jr., "Inoculation theory and resistance to persuasion in marketing," Psychology and Marketing 4(2): 157-165 (1987); Michael Pfau and others, "Efficacy of inoculation strategies in promoting resistance to political attack messages: application to direct mail," Communication Monographs 57(1): 25-43 (1990).

21. General works include P.L. Wright, "The harassed decision maker: time pressures, distractions, and the use of evidence," Journal of Applied Psychology 59: 555-561 (1974); Edward E. Smith, Nancy Adams, and Dennis Schorr, "Fact retrieval and the paradox of interference," Cognitive Psychology 10: 438-464 (1978); D.J. Bennett and J.D. Bennett, "Making the scene," in The psychology of social situations, eds. Adrian Furnham and Michael Argyle (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981); Howard Schuman and Stanley Presser, Questions and answers in attitude surveys: experiments on question form, wording, and context (New York: Academic Press, 1981); Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, "The effects of involvement on responses to argument quantity and quality central and peripheral routes to persuasion," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 46: 69-81 (1984); Michael L. Cody and Margaret L. McLaughlin, "The situation as a construct in interpersonal communication research," in Handbook of interpersonal communication, eds. Mark L. Knapp and Gerald R. Miller (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1985), pp. 263-312; Fritz Strack, Norbert Schwarz, and Elisabeth Gschneidinger, "Happiness and reminiscing: the role of time perspective, affect, and mode of thinking," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 49: 1460-1469 (1985); Leonard L. Martin, "Set/reset: use and disuse of concepts in impression formation," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 51: 493-504 (1986); Norbert

Schwarz and Hans-J. Hippler, "What response scales may tell your respondents: informative functions of response alternatives," in Social information processing and survey methodology, eds. Hans-J. Hippler, Norbert Schwarz, and Seymour Sudman (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1987), pp. 163-178; Loyd S. Pettegrew, "The importance of context in applied communication research," Southern Speech Communication Journal 53(4): 331-339 (1988); Roger Tourangeau and Kenneth A. Rasinski, "Cognitive processes underlying context effects in attitude measurement," Psychological Bulletin 103(3): 299-314 (1988); Michael Eaves, "The effects of proxemic violations as distractors on persuasive message attempts," paper presented at the annual meeting fo the Southern Speech Communication Association, Charleston, SC, April, 1990. **Studies of primary/recency on persuasive message acceptance include** Frederick H. Lund, "The psychology of belief: IV. the law of primary in persuasion," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 20: 181-191 (1925); Arthur T. Jersild, "Primacy, recency, frequency, and vividness," Journal of Experimental Psychology 12: 58-70 (1929); Harvey Cromwell and Richard Kunkel, "The relative effect on audience attitude of the first versus the second argumentative speech of a series," Speech Monographs 17: 105-122 (1950); Percy H. Tannenbaum, "Effect of serial position on recall of radio news stories," Journalism Quarterly 31: 319-323 (1954); Carl I. Hovland, ed., The order of presentation in persuasion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957); Norman Miller and Donald T. Campbell, "Recency and primacy in persuasion as a function of the timing of speeches and measurements," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 59: 1-9 (1959); Clara W. Mayo and Walter H. Crockett, "Cognitive complexity and primacy-recency effects in impression formation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 68: 335-338 (1964); W. Wilson and Chester Insko, "Recency effects in face-to-face interaction," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 9: 21-23 (1968); and Norman M. Bradburn, "Question-wording effects in surveys," in Asking questions, ed. Seymour Sudman and Norman M. Bradburn (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982); **and researchers who have examined effects of the quantity of information include** Jacob Jacoby, Donald E. Speller, and Carol John Berning, "Brand choice behavior as a function of information load: replication and extension," Journal of Consumer Research 1(1): 33-42 (1974); John Saltiel and Joseph Woelfel, "Inertia in cognitive processes: role of accumulated information in attitude change," Human Communication Research 1(4): 333-344 (1975); Ruth H. Phelps and James Shanteau, "Livestock judges: how much information can an expert use?" Organization Behavior and Human Performance 21: 209-219 (1978); Don W. Stacks and Judee K. Burgoon, "The role of nonverbal behaviors as distractors in resistance to persuasion in interpersonal context," Central States Speech Journal 32(2): 61-73 (1981); David B. Buller, "Distraction during persuasive communication: a meta-analytic review," Communication Monographs 53(2): 91-114 (1986). C. Werner, "Intrusiveness and persuasive impact of three communication media," Journal of Applied Social Psychology 8(2): 145-162 (1978) **reports on effects of persuasion if face-to-face versus by phone or in writing.**

22. **See notes to follow on specific aspects of the message that have been researched. One researcher who examines most of these elements is** Tamara Carbone, "Stylistic variables as related to source credibility: a content analysis approach," Speech Monographs 42: 99-106 (1975). **DeVito analyses several in his articles**: Joseph A. DeVito, A quantitative analysis of comprehension factors in samples of oral and written technical discourse of skilled communicators, Disseration, University of Illinois, 1964; Joseph A. DeVito, "Comprehension factors in oral and written discourse of skilled communicators," Speech Monographs 32(2): 124-128 (1965); Joseph A. DeVito, "Psychogrammatical factors in oral and written discourse by skilled communicators," Speech Monographs 33(1): 73-76 (1966); Joseph A. DeVito, "Style and stylistics: an attempt at definition," Quarterly Journal of Speech 53: 249 (1967). **Additional studies of the message include**: Allen H. Merriam, "Words and numbers: mathematical dimensions of rhetoric," Sourthern Communication Journal 55(4): 337-354 (1990)· Julia M. Allen, "Rhetorics of resistance," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Boston, MA, March, 1991; Melissa L. Powell, "The language of letters: a history of persuasive and psychological strategies in American business letters from 1908 through 1920," Journal of Business and Technical Communication 5(1): 33-47 (1991); Richard L. Stovall, "Argumentation and Public Relations," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, Tampa, FL, April 1991.

23. **readability**, Rudolf Flesch, How to test readability (New York: Harper, 1951), pp. 1-4; Gunning, Robert, The techniques of clear writing (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952), p. 38: Kelly F. Shuptine and Danieal D. McVicker, "Readability levels of magazine ads." Journal of Adversiting research 1981 (no. 5): 45. (See also research on "cognitive complexity" of persuasive messages by James L. Applegate, "The impact of construct system development on communication and impression formation in persuasive contexts," Communication Monographs 49(4): 277-289 (1982): James Wildeman, "Defining audience negatively: one way that writers keep readers from their texts," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, March, 1988.)

24. **vividness**, K. Warner Schaie, "A Q-sort study of color-mood association," Journal of Projective Techniques 25: 341-346 (1961); Hans Joachim Schiefer, "Effect of verbal and nonverbal vividness on students' information-processing," Perceptual and Motor Skills 63(1): 1106 (1986); Rebecca Collins and Shelley E. Taylor, "The vividness effect: elusive or illusory?" Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 24(1): 1-18 (1988); S. Michael Ralston and Carl A. Thameling, "Effect of vividness of language on information value of reference letters and job applicants' recommendations," Psychological Record 62: 867-870 (1988).

25. **human interest**, Carbone, op cit.

26. **vocabulary diversity**: James L. Bradac, Catherine W. Konsky, and Robert A. Davies, "Two studies of the effects of linguistic diversity upon judgments of communicator attributes and message effectiveness," Communication Monographs 43: 70-79 (1967); Kenneth Sereno and Gary J. Hawkins, "The effects of variations in speakers' nonfluency upon audience ratings of attitude toward the speech topic and speakers' credibility," Speech Monographs 34: 58-64 (1967); James C. McCroskey and R. Samuel Mehrley, "The effects of disorganization and nonfluency upon attitude change and source credibility," Speech Monographs 36: 13-21 (1969); James J. Bradac, John Waite Bowers, and John Courtwright, "Three language variables in communication research: intensity, immediacy, and diversity," Human Communication Research 5(3): 257-269 (1979); and Carbone, op cit.

27. **realism and verifiability**, Paul I. Rosenthal, "Specificity, verifiability, and message credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech 54: 393-401 (1971); James J. Bradac, Karin L. Sandell, and Lawrence A. Wenner, "The phenomenology of evidence: information-source utility in decision making," Communication Quarterly 27(4): 35-53 (1979); Richard Yalch and Rebecca Elmore-Yalch, "The effect of numbers on the route to persuasion," Journal of Consumer Research 11(1): 522-527 (1984). **An underlying measure in perceived message realism is concreteness vs abstraction**, for which Gillie's measurement technique is generally used: Paul J. Gillie, "A simplified formula for measuring abstraction in writing," Journal of Applied Psychology 41: 214-217 (1957).

28. **cohesion**, cf, Michael A.K. Haliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, Cohesion in English (London: Longman, 1976); William A. Villaume and Donald J. Cegala, "Interaction involvement and discourse strategies: the patterned use of cohesive devices in conversation," Communication Monographs 55: 22-40 (1988).

29. **use of metaphor and simile**, cf, John Waite Bowers and Michael M. Osborn, "Attitudinal effects of selected types of concluding metaphors in persuasive speeches," Speech Monographs 33(2): 147-155 (1966); N. Lamar Reinsch, Jr., "An investigation of the effects of the metaphor and simile in persuasive discourse," Speech Monographs 38(2): 142-145 (1971); James C. McCroskey and Walter H. Combs, "The effects of the use of analogy on attitude change and source credibility," Journal of Communication 19: 333-339 (1969); Eugene Borgida and Richard E. Nisbett, "The differential impact of abstract vs. concrete information on decisions," Journal of Applied Social Psychology 7(3): 258-271 (1977); Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, "Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: application to advertising," in Advertising and consumer psychology, ed. Larry Percy and Arch G. Woodside (Lexington, MS: D.C. Heath, 1983), pp. 3-23; William P. Wharton, "Imagery and the comprehension of college history texts: free response measure," Imagination, Cognition and Personality 7(4): 323-333 (1988); Jo Allen, "Thematic repetition as rhetorical technique," Journal of Technical Writing and Communication 21(1): 29-40 (1991).

31. Gladys Borchers, "An approach to the problem of oral style," Public Opinion Quarterly 33: 563-576 (1936); Joseph A. DeVito, A quantitative analysis of comprehension factors in samples of oral and written technical discourse of skilled communicators, Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1964; Joseph A. DeVito, "Comprehension factors in oral and written discourse of skilled communicators," Speech Monographs 32(2): 124-128 (1965); Joseph A. DeVito, "Psychogrammatical factors in oral and written discourse by skilled communicators," Speech Monographs 33(1): 73-76 (1966); James W. Gibson, Charles R. Gruner, Robert J. Kibler, and Francis J. Kelly, "A quantitative examination of differences and similarities in written and spoken messages," Speech Monographs 33(4): 444-451 (1966); Tamara Carbone, "Stylistic variables as related to source credibility: a content analysis approach," Speech Monographs 42: 99-106 (1975); Carl Jon Denbow, "Listenability and readability: an experimental study," Journalism Quarterly 52: 285-290 (1975); Deborah Tannen, "Relative focus on involvement in oral and written discourse," in Literacy, language, and learning, eds. David R. Olson, Nancy Torrance, and Angela Hildyard (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 124-147.

32. James Green, A comparison of oral and written language: a quantitative analysis of the structure and vocabulary of the oral and written language of a group of college students, Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1959; Elbert R. Moses, Jr., "A study of word diversification," Speech Monographs 26: 308-312 (1959); Milton W. Horowitz and John B. Newman, "Spoken and written expression: an experimental analysis," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 68: 640-647 (1964); Robert J. Kibler, "An experimental study of the impact of message style and channel in communication," paper presented at the Speech Association of America Convention, Chicago, December, 1964.

33. Thomas Clark, "The 1990 Top 100 Markets," Writer's Digest magazine, Writer's Yearbook, January 1990, pp. 56-63, 92-105.

34. Edward W. Minium, Statistical reasoning in psychology and education, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley, 1978), pp. 90-98.

35. Carbone, op cit.; Wayne A. Danielson and Sam Dunn Bryan, "Readability of wire stories in eight news categories," Journalism Quarterly 41:105-6 (1964); Pompeo Abruzzini, "Measuring language difficulty in advertising copy," Journal of Marketing 31: 26 (summer 1967); Rolph E. Anderson and Marvin A. Jolson, "Technical wording in advertising: implications for market segmentation," Journal of Marketing 44: 57 66 (Spring 1980); Judee K. Burgoon, Michael Burgoon, and Miriam Wilkinson, "Writing style as a predictor of newspaper readership, satisfaction, and image," Journalism Quarterly 58: 225-231 (1981); Guido H. Stempel, III, "Readability of Six Kinds of Content in Newspapers," Newspaper Research Journal April 1981, p. 32; Gilbert Len Fowler, Jr., and Edward J. Smith, "Readability of delayed and immediate reward content in Time and Newsweek,"

Jouralism Quarterly 59: 341-344, 420 (1982); David A. Wesson, "Readability as a factor in magazine ad copy recall." Journalism Quarterly 66(3): pp. 715-718 (1989).

36. Paul I. Rosenthal, "Specificity, verifiability, and message credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech 54: 393-401 (1971); Eugene Borgida and Richard E. Nisbett, "The differential impact of abstract vs. concrete information on decisions," Journal of Applied Social Psychology 7(3): 258-271 (1977); V. Hazelton, William R. Cupach, and Jo Liska, "Message style: an investigation of the perceived characteristics of persuasive messages," Journal of Social Behavior and Personality 1(4): 565-574 (1986); Hans Joachim Schiefer, "Effect of verbal and nonverbal vividness on students' information-processing," Perceptual and Motor Skills 63(1): 1106 (1986); Rebecca Collins and Shelley E. Taylor, "The vividness effect: elusive or illusory?" Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 24(1): 1-18 (1988); S. Michael Ralston and Carl A. Thameling, "Effect of vividness of language on information value of reference letters and job applicants' recommendations," Psychological Record 62: 867-870 (1988).

37. Carbone, op cit.

38. Carbone, op cit.; James J. Bradac, John Waite Bowers, and John Courtwright. "Three language variables in communication research: intensity, immediacy, and diversity," Human Communication Research 5(3): 257-269 (1979); James J. Bradac, Catherine W. Konsky, and Robert A. Davies, "Two studies of the effects of linguistic diversity upon judgments of communicator attributes and message effectiveness," Communication Monographs 43: 70-79 (1976).

39. Paul I. Rosenthal, "Specificity, verifiability, and message credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech 54: 393-401 (1971); Eugene Borgida and Richard E. Nisbett, "The differential impact of abstract vs. concrete information on decisions," Journal of Applied Social Psychology 7(3): 258-271 (1977).

40. Richard E. Petty and John T. Cacioppo, "Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37: 1915-1921 (1983).

41. V. Hazelton, William R. Cupach, and Jo Liska, "Message style: an investigation of the perceived characteristics of persuasive messages," Journal of Social Behavior and Personality 1(4): 565-574 (1986); Carbone, op cit.

42. Paul J. Gillie, "A simplified formula for measuring abstraction in writing," Journal of Applied Psychology 41: 214-217 (1957).

43. Michael A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, Cohesion in English (London: Longman, 1976); Jorge Hankamer and Ivan Sag, "Deep and surgace anaphora," Linguistic Inquiry 7: 3;91-428 (1976); H.G.

Widdowson, "Rules and procedures in discourse analysis," in The development of conversation and discourse, ed. T. Myers (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1979), pp. 61-71; Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang U. Dressler, Introduction to text linguistics (New York: Longman, 1981); John Joseph Gumperz, Discourse strategies (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Gillian Brown and George Yule, Discourse analysis (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983): Ivan Sag and Jorge Hankamer, "Toward a theory of anaphoric processing," Linguistics and Philosophy 7: 325-345 (1984); G.L. Murphy, "Processes of understanding anaphora," Journal of Memory and Language 24(3): 290-303 (1985): William A. Villaume and Donald J. Cegala, "Interaction involvement and discourse strategies: the patterned use of cohesive devices in conversation," Communication Monographs 55: 22-40 (1988).

44. John Waite Bowers and Michael M. Osborn, "Attitudinal effects of selected types of concluding metaphors in persuasive speeches," Speech Monographs 33(2): 147-155 (1966); N. Lamar Reinsch, Jr., "An investigation of the effects of the metaphor and simile in persuasive discourse," Speech Monographs 38(2): 142-145 (1971); James C. McCroskey and Walter H. Combs, "The effects of the use of analogy on attitude change and source credibility," Journal of Communication 19: 333-339 (1969).

45. N. Lamar Reinsch, Jr., "An investigation of the effects of the metaphor and simile in persuasive discourse," Speech Monographs 38(2): 142-145 (1971).

46. See James Aucoin, "News as Narrative: A Literature Review," unpublished paper, University of Missouri-Columbia, who cites Gaye Tuchman, "Telling stories," Journal of Communication 26(4): 93-97 (1978); Richard Rorty, Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); David L. Eason, "Tellling stories and making sense," Journal of Popular Culture 15(2): 125-129 (1981); Sharon Sperry, "Television news as narrative," in Understanding Television: Essays on Television as a Social and Cultural Force, ed. R. Adler (New York: Praeger, 1981); Michael Schudson, "The politics of narrative form: the emergence of news conventions in print and television," Daedalus 111(4): 97-112 (1982); W. Lance Bennett and Murray Edelman, "Toward a new political narrative," Journal of Communication 35: 156-171 (1985); Carlin Romano, "The grisly truth about bare facts," in Reading the News, eds R. Manoff and M. Schudson (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986); Jack Lule, "Hermaneutics and victimage: a critical approach to news of the shooting of KAL Flight 007," paper presented at AEJMC annual meeting, July 1988.

47. Aucoin, op cit., cites Norma Schulman, "A narrative theory approach to understanding news and journalistic form," paper presented at AEJMC annual meeting, August 1989; Linda Steiner, "Readers' readings: applications of reader-response theory," paper presented at AEJMC annual meeting, August 1987.

48. Sondra Perl, "The composing processes of unskilled college

writers," Research in the Teaching of English 13: 317-336 (1979). P.J. Burtis, Carl Bereiter, Marlene Scardamalia, and Jacqueline Tetroe, "The development of planning in writing," in Explorations in the development of writing, eds. C. Gordon Wells and Barry M. Kroll (Chichester: Wiley, 1983).

49. Carl Bereiter, P.J. Burtis, and Marlene Scardamalia, 'Cognitive operations in constructing main points in written composition,' Journal of Memory and Language 27: 261-278 (1988).

50. P.J. Burtis, Carl Bereiter, Marlene Scardamalia, and Jacqueline Tetroe, "The development of planning in writing," in Explorations in the development of writing, eds. C. Gordon Wells and Barry M. Kroll (Chichester: Wiley, 1983).

51. Minium, op cit.

#